

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of December 14, 2007. With this response, claims 1 and 2 are amended, claim 3 are canceled and all pending claims 1-2, and 4-6 are presented for reconsideration and favorable action.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The claims have been amended and are believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-6 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Again, the amended claims are believed to overcome this.

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon Wendt (US 7,075,919) in view of Kung et al. (US 6,826,173) and Chen et al. (US 2001/0030950). It is believed that the amended claims are patentably distinct from these references.

First, regarding novelty, the software portion is incorporated into claim 1 to show the software configuration of the system. Particularly, the amended claim 1 defines the operation system of devices such as Linux system and they cooperate with each other, support IGMP protocol, and achieve a control to the multicast media streams. That is, the software portion and the hardware portions cooperate with each other to provide the services such as television, Internet surfing and telephone communications.

The present invention relates to a community network system with broadband integrated services, which focuses on the digital television receipt and the A/V presentations for the homes in a living district. Meanwhile, the system can provide television education (remote education), IP telephone services and Internet services. Furthermore, the present application can provide facilities for the intellectual management system of a district to implement the service integration of television network, telephone network and computer network. Although Wendt can provide a network configuration for integrating an audio service, a video service and a digital service especially in office network, it is difficult for Wendt to meet the requirement of a community such as a living district. In fact, the network configuration proposed by Wendt fails to suggest the settings for the community and cannot be adapted to the applications of the community. Furthermore, Wendt, Kung and Chen cannot implement the television, Internet surfing and IP telephone services at the same time.

In addition, the applicant would like to explain the differences between the CPN (Customer Premises Network) and the Community Network. The customer premise may be a commercial building or a university. Community means a district or locality in

which such a group lives in the same locality and under the same government. The CPN is mainly directed to data service while the Community Network is mainly directed to the video service.

As can be seen from the above, the present application and the cited documents focus on different technical problems, thus there is no motive for the ordinary person to combine these existing techniques and apply it to community. Even combined, it is impossible to obtain the technical of the amended claim 1. That is, an ordinary person in the field of technology would not obtain the technical solution of the amended claims from the disclosure of Wendt, Kung and Chen. Therefore, the amended claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited documents.

Regarding obviousness, the amended claim 1 relates to a community network system with broadband integrated services to provide three services such as television, telephone and network at the same time under a single network configuration. As well known, the existing techniques such as xDSL, Cable modem and FTTx+LAN could not integrate three services as described above. According to the amended claim 1, due to home gateway and wireless gateway, three services such as television, telephone and network can be provided with a user at the same time under a single network configuration. In addition, the modules of software distributed on the devices can cooperate with each other to achieve a control to the multicast media streams, and provide types of service, time of service and an amount of traffic used by the user. Thus, a plurality of services can be provided with the user under a single network without need the respective networks for each service. Furthermore, it is not necessary for each service provider to arrange dedicated facilities. Two or more operators can share one network configuration such that the resources can be saved. Accordingly, the amended claim 1 can overcome the defect of non-patentable utility.

The hardware portions mentioned in the amended claim 1 can be found in the description page 4 line 14 to page 5 line 2, and the software portions can be found in description page 5 line 29 to page 6 line 20.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Judson K. Champlin/

Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JKC:lrs